

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe

Vol. I, No. 7

Wednesday, December 11, 1918

Price, 3 Cents

They Are Still There!

By John Reed

AT the present time the Allied armies in Russia—American troops among them—are supporting three "Governments" at Archangel, Vladivostok and Omsk. These "Governments," which are said to be "supported by the majority of the Russian people" (whoever they may be), have one characteristic in common; they stand for the return of Czarism. So that the Allies, who started out with the scarcely-disguised intention of "restoring the Constituent Assembly," and thus setting up a bourgeois Republic, now find themselves in the position of gendarmes of the Counter Revolution.

According to official statements of the American and Japanese Governments, the objects of intervention in Russia were, protection of military supplies in Archangel and Vladivostok against German and Austrian war-prisoners, and assistance to the Czecho-Slovaks, who were presumably trying to leave Russia. The most "solemn and public" promises were given by both Governments that they had no intention of "interfering in the internal affairs of Russia." But the British Government, which was associated with the Americans and Japanese, stated through Lloyd George that the purpose of the intervention was to create "a center for the elements opposed to Bolshevism." And the French Government, whose aims in Russia can least bear the light of liberal scrutiny, did not deign to publish them.

As soon as foreign troops landed on Russian soil the Commissaire for Foreign Affairs, Tchitcherine, addressed a note to the Allied and American Governments, asking why no notice of intervention had ever been given to the Government, and demanding a bill of complaint.

"If the Allied and American Governments have any cause for complaint against the conduct of the Government of the Russian Republic," he said in effect, "we respectfully ask why it has not been called to our attention, that we may satisfy it. . . ."

When the armistice with Germany was signed by the Allied and American Governments, Tchitcherine asked for an armistice with the Soviet Government also.

Both these communications were ignored. It may be urged that neither the Allies nor the United States recognized or now recognize the Russian Government. But for months all these Governments carried on semi-official relations with Russia, have made demands on it again and again; and in March, President Wilson publicly addressed the Fourth Congress of Soviets as representatives of the Russian people. . . . Is the only conclusion possible from all this that the aims of intervention are so frankly imperialistic that any statement of them would be extremely compromising. . . . ?

Even those persons who were persuaded by the Sisson documents and other forgeries, and the subsidized propaganda of Miliukov's Ambassador in Washington, Mr. Bakhmetiev, that Lenin and Trotzky were German agents, must now be considerably puzzled. If it were true that the Bolsheviks in Russia were a tyrannical minority supported by German gold and German bayonets, the collapse of Imperial Germany would necessarily entail the collapse of the Bolsheviks—just as it entailed the collapse of the Ukrainian dictatorship, and the "National Council" of the Baltic

provinces. But the defeat of Germany has merely strengthened the Russian Soviet Government. Only the most credulous will be able to swallow the accusation of the capitalist press that the Kaiser, defeated in Germany, is still ruler of Russia!

One of the armistice terms imposed upon Germany requires that the indemnity paid by Russia to Germany must be surrendered to the Allies—to hold in trust for some future Russian Government. This Government, of course, must be acceptable to the Allies. There remains in Russia no force with any power except the force of the Black Hundreds—the Dark Forces against which the Russian people revolted in March, 1917, to the applause of the liberal world; any other Government set up in Russia must immediately fall, for the Russian "moderates" and "liberals" have no following whatever.

This is clearly shown by the history of the

Famine in Russia

A striking light is thrown on the cause of food difficulties which are experienced by Soviet Russia, by a letter written on September 4th by M. Rene Marchand, the well known "Figaro" correspondent in Russia, to M. Poincaré, the original of which has been discovered during a search made in his house by the agent of the Extraordinary Commission for Fighting the Counter Revolution, and which is now published by the Moscow "Izvestia." In the course of his letter, M. Marchand deplores the fact that—"Of late we have allowed ourselves to be drawn exclusively into a fight against Bolshevism thus engaging, without any advantage whatsoever to the interests of the Entente, in a policy which can have no other result than intensifying unnecessarily the sufferings and despair of the Russian people, to aggravate the existing anarchy and to accentuate the famine and civil war as well as the party feuds."

M. Marchand then reports a secret conference at the American Consulate-General at the end of August last, which was attended, in addition to the American Consul-General Poole, by all the other representatives of the Allied Governments and by himself.

"I then learnt that the British Agent was preparing the destruction of the railway bridge over the river Volkhoff. A glance at the map will show that the destruction of this bridge would be equivalent to the delivery of Petrograd to death by starvation. The British agent added the information that he had already made an attempt to blow up the Tcherpoff Viaduct which would have had the same disastrous effect on the food supply of Petrograd. The conversation then turned on the subject of the destruction of the various railway lines. One of the agents mentioned that he had secured the valuable assistance of the railway employees, who, however, were opposed to destruction on a large scale; the corrupted employees were only prepared to assist in the blowing-up of trains carrying war materials. I do not want to dwell upon details but I am profoundly convinced that these were not isolated acts on the part of individual agents. But even if they were isolated acts their effect would be equally pernicious; they are calculated to draw Russia into an endless and even bloodier political fight and to deliver it to inhuman sufferings by death and starvation. Moreover, the sufferings would affect almost entirely the poor and the middle classes of the population, while the richer people and the bourgeoisie would always be able to find the means of escaping to the Ukraine or abroad."

M. Marchand notes that throughout the conference, not a single word was uttered about fighting Germany and expresses his profound conviction that the Soviet Government would not call in Germany to its assistance.

various so-called "Governments" which have been set up and supported by Allied troops. These Governments—the Government of the North at Archangel, the All-Russian Provisional Government at Ufa and at Omsk, and the Siberian Government at Irkutsk, centered about certain reactionary delegates to the Constituent Assembly—Tschalkovsky, Avksentieff, Zenzinov and others; men who were too conservative even for the "moderate" Socialist parties to which they belonged under Kerensky's regime.

It is a proof of the power of the Bolsheviks over the masses of the people, and a justification of the dispersal of the Constituent Assembly, that these "liberals" and "Socialists" were forced to depend for their fighting forces upon renegade Cossacks and Chinese mercenaries under outcasts like General Semionov, Horvath and Gurko, and Admiral Kolchak; upon the Czecho-Slovaks, the Japanese, and the Allies. . . . And as was natural in such a situation, even the Allied and American troops could not save these "governments" from being overthrown by the Russian riff-raff they had evoked to fight their battles.

The pressure upon the Russian Soviets has been terrible. The Allied diplomatic representatives in Moscow, it seems, made use of their diplomatic privileges to plot counter-revolution and even the blowing up of bridges and munitions work, after the pattern of the Kaiser's hirelings in this country. Armed attacks having failed, deliberate and concerted efforts are being made to starve the Russian people into submission. In answer to this the Russian Soviet Government, while Allied troops were actually shooting down Russian peasants by the thousand in the North and on the East, treated subjects and citizens of the Allied nations and the United States with the greatest consideration. And in all this time they have left no stone unturned to make peace—even, according to dispatches offering reparation for property confiscated or destroyed in Russia, and for repudiated debts.

Shall the United States be a party to what, after all, has inevitably taken on the significance of an attempt to restore the Russian Czar?

Mr. Lloyd George, speaking in London the other day, came out very strongly against militarism. "Gigantic armies must not be permitted in the future," he said. Of course, being only tyros in the game, we very naturally were making mental enquiries as to how and by whom was the forbidding to be done if some nation took it into its head to have a lot of soldiers, but when we scanned the pages of our newspaper a little more thoroughly we found that on the same day that Lloyd George made his speech Winston Churchill had written an article advocating a gigantic British navy.

So it's really quite simple, after all. The gigantic navy will not permit any gigantic armies. Thus is peace made secure.

There seems to be quite a storm about whether or not the Kaiser's letter of resignation is explicit enough, but this would appear to be an unimportant detail in view of the fact he was fired quite definitely.

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe.

LOUIS C. FRAINA Editor
EADMONN MACALPINE Associate Editor
Contributing Editors

SCOTT NEARING LUDWIG LORE
JOHN REED SEN KATAYAMA
N. I. HOURWICH G. WEINSTEIN

ISSUED EVERY WEDNESDAY AND SATURDAY
By Local Boston, Socialist Party
H. G. Steiner, Business Manager
885 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

Wednesday, December 11, 1918

The Coming Era of Strikes

THE War Labor Board, through its joint chairmen, W. H. Taft and Basil Manly, have informed the Bethlehem Steel Company, which asked to have full freedom in dealing with employees, that the Board's power to make wage awards and its jurisdiction over disputes continue until a peace treaty is ratified. And then? With the end of the war and the peculiar industrial conditions it created, will come readjustment; and with readjustment will come an era of great industrial struggles, greater than any this country has ever seen. That will be the opportunity of Socialism. The characteristic of revolutionary Socialism is that it study the alignment of social forces, the characteristic of each period in social development, and adapt itself and these characteristics to the task of developing the final struggle. The characteristic of the situation in the United States during the coming two or three years will be great industrial strikes. This will test the Socialist Party. If we are simply to use these strikes to make political capital, we shall miss a great opportunity; but if we absorb ourselves in these strikes, appreciate that in industry lies the power of the proletariat, that it is the function of Socialism to use strikes to develop finer industrial organizations and general industrial action of the workers, out of which emerges the class power for the final struggle, then the Socialist Party will measure to the opportunity, and a new and more vital Socialism come into being.

Why This Reserve, Pray?

IN the New York "Call" of December 6, there is a letter from Joseph Shaplen, which defends the moderate Socialists and the Constituent Assembly in Russia against the Bolsheviks and the Soviets, saying that if defense of the Constituent Assembly is reactionary, then "the Social-Democratic and Social-Revolutionist parties of Russia are 'reactionist,' and likewise are Ebert, Haase, Bernstein, Kautsky, Ledebour and the entire host of German Socialists. And the only 'revolutionists' are the Bolsheviks and the Spartacus Group." On the Constituent Assembly, the "Call," in its reply, says: "We can not enter an argument on the relative merits of Constituent Assemblies and Soviets." But this is precisely the vital issue, the real argument, the dividing force of Socialism in Germany and Russia. Why does the "Call" dodge on this issue? Is it because its ideology and its Socialism are, after all, petty bourgeois? As to the Bolsheviks and the Spartacus Group—they are the only revolutionists, expressing the real tendency of revolutionary Socialism. The "Call" completely ignores this phase of Shaplen's challenge. Why this reserve? Shouting about Socialism and the Revolution, making concessions to party opinion, while suppressing or camouflaging fundamental issues is the policy of moderate, petty bourgeois Socialism, a policy against Socialism and that promotes disaster. It is a policy that, in the final test, becomes counter-revolutionary!

The Italian "Socialist" Mission

THE irresistible necessity of Socialism is now clearly apparent—necessary both to the capitalist masters of the world and to the proletarian masters of the coming world. Having plunged into the war, governments used "Socialism" as a decoy, as a means of reconciling the proletariat to the war, manufacturing an ideology for the war. When the proletarian revolution came, in Russia and in Germany, Capitalism desperately turned to a traitor "Socialism" to preserve the old order, precisely as the proletariat turned to revolutionary Socialism to create the new order. Governments have been sending "labor" and "Socialist" missions to other nations—all in the great

cause of reconciling the proletariat to the war. Surely a great Socialist task in an epoch when Capitalism was verging on collapse! When Lloyd George and Clemenceau became fearful of the awakening of the workers, they invited over a "labor" mission of the A. F. of L., which tried to prevent the awakening,—precisely the purpose of the "Social-Democratic League" mission of Simons, Spargo & Co. An Italian "Socialist" mission is now in our midst, approved, but not officially, by the Italian royal Government. These "Socialists" are discredited in their own country, and represent nothing except petty bourgeois aspirations and a small clique of renegade Socialists. They are men who have been corrupted by nationalism and social-Imperialism, betrayers of the proletariat. One of them, d'Ambris, was a former Syndicalist, who urged Italy to war before she made the decision. And it is characteristic that d'Ambris should now talk of the territorial squabbles between Italy and the Croats and Jugoslavs, insisting upon Italy's "full geographical, historical and ethical rights in the Adriatic regions." Surely an inspiring activity, for one who formerly insisted that Revolution was the only concern of the proletariat! The proletariat will yet acquire full class consciousness, will yet annihilate its betrayers.

The Struggle Starts

THE decisive struggle of the Revolution is on in Germany—the struggle for state power. The converging attack upon the bourgeois "Socialist" Provisional Government has started, assuming the preliminary form of an attack of the reactionary forces against the Soviets and particularly the Spartacus Socialists. The first phase of the struggle has ended in a victory for revolutionary Socialism.

The series of events ending in the first phase of the struggle reveal the counter-revolutionary trend of the Provisional Government, a counter-revolutionary trend determined by the fact that the bourgeois "Socialist" government is a middle of the road affair, consequently developing counter-revolution and in the final test necessarily acting against the proletarian revolution.

In spite of the demand for the resignation of Dr. Solf and Dr. Erzberger, these two representatives of the old regime still remain in the government. Kurt Eisner, Premier of the Bavarian Republic, ceases his radical talk, accepts compromise and decides upon a "moderate program of socialization." A meeting at Cologne under the auspices of the Catholic Centre Party repudiates the "extremists" at Berlin, and decides upon the organization of an independent state of Rhineland and Westphalia, "under the German Empire." German officials who returned from the armistice conference at Spa intimate that the Entente would demand the dissolution of the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils,—these officials, appointed by the "Socialist" government, being representatives of the old regime and the bourgeoisie, and probably having discussed with the Entente representatives action against the Revolution.

The counter-revolutionary movement assumes the form of "support" of the Provisional Government and action against the Soviets and the Spartacides. Everywhere the counter-revolution prepares itself behind the screen of the "Socialist" government of Ebert, Haase & Co., and the press reports declarations of the bourgeois representatives that they support the government because "Socialism" is necessary as a temporary instrument to use against the masses.

But, simultaneously with this counter-revolutionary trend, the Spartacides, revolutionary Socialism, acquires influence and power at terrific speed, and the attack centres upon them. In Dresden, the Spartacides secure control of the Soviet; in Rhineland and Westphalia their agitators are extraordinarily active, their domination in Cologne determining the bourgeois officials, it is reported, to call in the British troops of occupation before the stipulated time; while in Berlin they control absolutely certain strategic sections of the city. The immediate task of the Spartacides is propaganda, out of which will ultimately issue revolutionary action for the seizure of power. But the counter-revolution determines to provoke an immediate clash, apprehensive of the growing strength of revolutionary Socialism.

The means of provoking this clash, obviously, is the use of reactionary troops; and this is one consequence of the moderate "Socialist" opposition to the arming of the proletariat, and the decision of the government not to demobilize certain troops which it had previously agreed to.

The opportunity for provoking this clash came on Friday. A detachment of reactionary troops appears at the building of the Soviet Executive Committee and arrests the members, the officer declaring the Provisional Government had issued these orders by telephone. Simultaneously, other reactionary troops appear in front of the Chancellor's palace and offer Ebert the presidency of the German Republic, which he graciously refuses, calling for "three cheers for our German country." A meeting is in session, organized by the Spartacides to demand immediate demobilization of the army and the arming of the proletariat, where it is announced that the Executive Committee of the Soviets is under arrest. With cries of "Let's hang Ebert, down with the counter-revolution, down with Hindenburg and all reactionary officers," the meeting forms a parade, proceeding from the Chaussee-Strasse to the corner of the Invalidenstrasse, where a furious machine-gun fire opens upon them. These reactionary troops were apparently "planted" at the strategic point—proof of a formidable counter-revolutionary conspiracy. A desperate street battle ensues and the marchers are dispersed, with sixteen killed and over fifty injured. The offices of Liebknecht's paper, "The Red Flag," are raided. Having heard of the arrest of the Soviets' officials, the Government denies having issued an order for their arrest; they are freed and the officer in charge of their captors is himself placed under arrest. (Is this a resemblance to Kerensky's repudiation of Kornilov in September, 1917?) Then—the masses rise in all their giant strength and crush the reactionary coup.

This counter-revolutionary coup has many significant features. It was an attack, not simply upon the Spartacides, but upon the Soviets—since the Soviets' existence are a guaranty that ultimately revolutionary ideas will secure control; this attack upon the Soviets coincides with an offer of the presidency to Ebert by the counter-revolution, proof of the reactionary character of the Ebert-Haase Government and that this government constitutes the bulwark of reaction; instead of the revolutionary masses being dispersed, they emerge stronger than ever, the Provisional Government, which alone would profit from the successful coup, being compelled to disown it and explain it away—while preparing itself by not demobilizing any more troops.

The answer of the revolutionary masses to the reaction was instant and aggressive. Instead of dispersing, the masses acted. Huge demonstrations were held on the following two or three days, at which Liebknecht spoke, urging the people to erect barricades and put down the counter-revolutionary government by force of arms, to depose the government and place all government power in the Soviets. "Down with Ebert and Scheidemann!" was the general cry of the demonstrators, "Down with the Government!" Realizing the desperate character of the counter-revolution, the proletariat is arming, preparing for battle at each of their meetings. The day after the counter-revolutionary attack, an enormous meeting of the Spartacides was held at the Tiergarten; mounted on a statue of the Hohenzollerns, Liebknecht urged action against the counter-revolution, stigmatized the government as counter-revolutionary, and urged the proletariat to seize all power. The semi-circle of the meeting was flanked on all sides by revolutionary troops with machine guns and armored trucks commanding all approaches, and prepared for any counter-revolutionary attacks.

The counter-revolutionary coup in Berlin on December 6, resembles, in a way, the July 16-17 "uprising" in Petrograd. The Russian masses determined upon a demonstration against the Provisional Government; counter-revolutionary gangs and reactionary government troops attack the marchers; street fighting for two days, the dispersal of the masses, the arrest of Bolsheviks, including Trotsky, and an order for the arrest of Lenin. The purpose was to annihilate the masses by means of a premature clash; and it was a temporary success. But the counter-revolutionary coup in Berlin immediately strengthens the masses; a fundamental difference; and it will accelerate enormously the march of revolutionary events.

What the bourgeois press, with deceptive intentions, rather than from stupidity, describes as "riot," "anarchy," etc., really constitutes an explosive expression of the struggle for power. The conscious purpose of the counter-revolutionary coup was to annihilate the masses by dispersing the Soviets, place all power in the "Socialist" Provisional Government, restore "order," and then, having conquered the revolutionary masses.

complete the job by crushing the "Socialist" government after its function of proletarian deception is unnecessary. In this process, the counter-revolution must not alone annihilate the Spartacides, but equally the Soviets—precisely as, in Russia, the counter-revolutionary campaign developed from a campaign against the "extreme" Bolsheviks into a campaign against the Soviets. The only answer to this campaign, if the revolutionary masses are not to surrender unconditionally, is "All power to the Soviets!"—the new Socialist state of proletarian dictatorship.

The Ebert-Haase Government is reactionary, and consciously and unconsciously promotes the counter-revolution. It does not act against the bourgeois reaction, while its policy and its very presence encourages counter-revolutionary action against the proletarian masses. The independent Socialists in the Government, willy nilly, are criminal participants in this reaction.

This fact is being appreciated by many Independent Socialists, who, together with the masses, are more and more turning to the Spartacus program. Haase's attitude has been bitterly attacked by Independent Socialist organs; and this criticism is developing new strength since the events of Friday. A press report says: "A savage onslaught against the majority Socialists and their representatives in the Government has been made by the Independent Socialist organ, and this newspaper's almost enthusiastic defense of the Spartacus Group is construed here as showing that the Ebert-Haase factions are swiftly approaching a break. The 'Vorwärts' (organ of the Ebert-Scheidemann Socialists) spiritedly attacks the Haase party organ's defense of the Spartacus Group and Liebknecht and for its onslaught on the Ebert-Scheidemann faction, and asks whether the Independents have no sense of their responsibility when they endeavor to excuse Liebknecht's 'vile activities.'"

The decisive struggle for power is coming to a head. Revolutions cannot temporize on this issue: it is either power to the bourgeois Provisional Government or power to the Councils of Workers' Delegates—power to Capitalism, or Socialism. The Ebert-Haase Government will be annihilated—either by the bourgeois or by the proletariat. There can be no middle-of-the-road policy in government during a revolution. Nor can there be any middle-road policy for the Soviets, or for Socialism. The Independent Socialists must decide: either accept the Spartacus program of proletarian dictatorship or accept the counter-revolution. Compromise promotes reaction. Life itself determines the issue, and the necessary revolutionary action.

Sinister Proposals

THE press reports that "five American officers arrived at Coblenz Thursday, and conferred with the Burgomaster, the local German commander, and the railway authorities."

The press reports that "the premature occupation of Coblenz [by American troops] is due to the request of the German authorities, who are apprehensive of the conditions that might prevail there after the withdrawal of the German forces."

The press reports that "British troops have been hurried to Cologne to maintain order, but the nature of the trouble, or how serious it is, is not stated in the brief unofficial announcement. It is reported that Red forces and their opponents have been rioting and that the situation demands armed British forces."

The occupation of Cologne and Coblenz by the Allied troops is in fulfillment of the armistice terms. The associated governments have not declared any other purpose. But the Boston "Post" in its issue of December 9, in black-face type at the head of its front page, screams:

"American troops have hurried farther into German territory, at the request of the authorities, to protect the German people from themselves. The conquerors are now saviors, holding in check the dragon of Bolshevism which threatens to make chaos of a once mighty empire. In an orderly reconstruction lies the one hope of the Teutonic peoples. Crimes against civilization must be fully expiated, but civilization also hopes that the horror of anarchy may be spared Germany."

And the "American," in its issue of December 9, reports that "the French General Dupont appeared suddenly in the streets of Berlin in an automobile at the height of the street fighting Friday night," and adds: "The arrival of General Dupont in Berlin is regarded here as significant of the Allies' intentions to interfere to restore order in Germany."

Are all these reports evidence of the Allies' intentions to intervene in Germany to crush "the dragon of Bolshevism"? The reports are not at all conclusive. Yet the press jumps ahead of the actual facts: is this simply propaganda or is it prejudgment of the government's intentions?

The press paints a beautiful, idyllic picture of the former enemies uniting against a new enemy, the revolutionary proletariat. Dense and brutal, the press does not realize that, were this a fact, it would be a criminal enormity—an enormity paralleled only by the alliance of the Prussia of Bismarck and the France of the infamous Thiers against the Paris Commune in 1871, when the savagery previously expressed against each other concentrated in the terrible storm that beat mercilessly upon the devoted heads of the men, women and children of the Commune, who were massacred in droves.

"At the request of the German authorities," Who are these authorities? They are the representatives of Imperialism in Germany, they are the men who constituted the forces of the Imperial autocracy, who for four and a half years "waged war against civilization, were responsible for the murder of women and children, raped Belgium, violated all the laws of God and man, who should be extirpated and punished for their crimes." Were these statements of the press made during four and a half years against "the German authorities" true or false? If false, why the war, why all the talk of punishing the guilty and preserving civilization? And if true, how comes it that the press making these statements now wants an alliance with these very murderers, Huns, enemies of civilization?

What the press actually proposes is unity of the "makers of democracy" with the "rapers of democracy!"

But, then, the former enmity between the two must have been simply a "misunderstanding," which is immediately "made up" when danger looms from Socialism and the revolutionary proletariat.

The war, then, must have been an imperialistic war, a capitalist war: that is the only conclusion deducible from the proposals and the logic of the press. But to say, and this is precisely what the press does say, in fact, that the war was imperialistic and capitalistic, is a violation of the Espionage Act, for saying which a Socialist would be heavily punished. . . . Will the "Post" be indicted for violation of the Espionage Act? . . .

The German autocracy, which consisted not simply of the Kaiser but of the whole system comprised in "the German authorities," was indicted, and indicted justly, for being irresponsible to the will of the people, for not representing the people. But these "authorities" representing the minority have not become representatives of the majority overnight: they are still old usurpers; and if they do call in alien troops to crush the proletarian revolution, they will conclusively prove that they are a usurping minority, compelled to call in alien aid to maintain their power.

But if the Allies should, as the press proposes, do this very thing, they will fight and shed the blood of men to maintain that autocratic minority in power which they previously declared must be warred against and annihilated precisely because it was an autocratic minority. What, then, becomes of the war to make the world safe for democracy?

It is clear that the proposals of the American press are actually seditious, even bordering on treason. . . .

The press is in a peculiar pickle. When the revolutionary Socialists are reported as losing influence in Germany, the press declares that the German people must pay up to the hilt, that they must be shown no mercy, that they deserve to suffer. But when the revolutionary Socialists loom up threateningly, appear on the verge of seizing power and organizing a proletarian Soviet Republic, the press becomes sympathetic, declares that the "German people must be protected from themselves," that "crimes against civilization must be fully expiated, but civilization also hopes that the horror of anarchy may be spared Germany."

This is punctuated by sad remarks about the "chaos of a once mighty Empire:" does the capitalist press really regret the death of this Empire? Surely not, if it means Socialism!

The shameless, counter-revolutionary proposals are not the consequence of love of the German people: these "must pay." They are not the consequence of love of democracy: the cause of real democracy is lost in Germany unless the proletarian revolution conquers. They are not a consequence of horror of anarchy: Capitalism itself is one long horror of anarchy, the war itself was

anarchy and horror. No; the proposals are a consequence of the determination that Socialism shall not conquer in Germany, as it did in Russia, since that would mean the end of Capitalism everywhere within the coming ten or twenty years.

These proposals of the reactionary press are class proposals, to conserve the interests of Capitalism. There is, indeed, a tendency noticeable in the German bourgeoisie to ask the Allies to come in should the workers really seize all power, realize Socialism—precisely as the Russian bourgeoisie, through Milyukov and others, proposed that the Germans should march into Russia to restore the sacred rights of private property.

It is the class struggle; it is Capitalism against Socialism; it is a proposal to repeat the criminal murderous measures of the unity of Prussia and France against the Commune.

Bolshevikjabs

THIS Bolshevism is a terrible thing once it gets going—even Burleson is practicing it on the hotel men.

A few days ago the workers of London decided to hold a meeting in the Albert Hall, the largest hall in the city, but the owners did not like the sentiments expressed the last time the workers met there, so they decided that such a fine building was not meant for the common herd and, in strict accordance with capitalist ethics, they intimated that they would break their contract and call the meeting off. The electricians' union decided that in such an event they would shut off the lights from the next ball scheduled at the hall and the taxi-drivers' union also threatened to boycott the building. The meeting was accordingly held. Yes, just the same sort of tactics as will free Mooney.

Mr. Walter H. Long, British Secretary of State for the Colonies, speaking at Bristol is reported as saying that although England did not desire to enlarge her empire "he saw no alternative to the solution of the problem of the German colonies save by their inclusion in the empire" and, bearing the principle of self-determination well in mind, he continued "where the natives had been consulted they overwhelmingly favored that course."

This touching example of England's willingness to have the odds and ends of the earth thrust upon her is merely another proof of the cleansing power of democracy. If England had not become enamored of that magic word we might expect another war, along the lines of the Boer War, in which the old lion would valiantly resist all attempts to thrust fresh territory upon him.

The National Security League is out to fight Bolshevism. This is a good sign, but we hope they won't be too hard on Root.

"Nobody can or will doubt the President's sincere desire to represent American thought at Paris. The trouble is..." says The New York Times editorially and then proceeds in a full column to demonstrate the fact that it is nobody. "Open confession is good for the soul."

Jerome K. Jerome, the well-known English humorist, becomes very serious in an article to the London Daily News under the title "Wilson or Lenin?" He apparently knows that the world is feeling sick but he makes a serious mistake in his diagnosis of the case when he takes the liberal attitude that the disease is too much capitalism.

He gets very angry with the British, French and American capitalists for becoming autocrats in much the same manner as an amateur doctor might become incensed at gripe bacilli for developing into pneumonia germs.

After berating the capitalists, Mr. Jerome holds Russia up as the awful example of what happens to bad little capitalist germs who insist on developing into full grown autocrats, and, in common with his school of quacks, he advocates the application of palliatives that will stop their growth.

The real disease is capitalism, not too much capitalism, and the only treatment that will save the patient is an operation. Wilson is a physician; Lenin is a surgeon.

Frederick William Hohenzollern is quoted as saying "I have not renounced anything. . . ." In other words "Having nothing to renounce, I renounce nothing" which seems to us to be a very fair position from a philo-sophical standpoint.

It looks very much as if Chili was going to give the lie to all this talk about "the last war."

Arming the Proletariat in Germany

THE other day, the press published a statement that the diplomatic corps in Berlin had asked the German Government for "protection" against the "anarchistic propaganda" of the Spartacus Socialists and their campaign for the general arming of the proletariat.

It is not the business of the diplomatic corps to protest against this armament. But the diplomatic corps, necessarily representing the interests of international Capitalism, protests against a revolutionary measure—in the name of humanity!

This is natural. It is not natural, however, that men claiming to represent Socialism should equally oppose the arming of the proletariat, proposed as a necessary measure of the Revolution by the Spartacus Group. The discussion about arming the proletarian masses has come up more than once in the Berlin Soviets, and Ebert, Scheidemann & Co., together with hesitating, neither-fish-flesh-nor-yet-fowl Socialists, have declared against the proposed measure most bitterly. This is directly counter-revolutionary.

The great problem of a revolution is the problem of power—shall power reside in the masses, or shall it reside in the bourgeois "representatives" of the masses? This problem is an aspect of the problem of state organization—shall revolutionary reconstruction proceed on the basis of the parliamentary, bourgeois state, or on the measures to prevent these officers from entering the country as commanders of troops.

The old state is the state of a society based on class divisions, an expression of class rule, an instrument for the oppression of the masses and baffling the will and the action of the masses, centralizing power in a bureaucracy, police, army and judiciary. This state, in spite of republican, parliamentary forms, retains all the essential machinery of oppression of the monarchical state, since the monarchy and the parliamentary state are each the expression of class rule, each the form of authority of a ruling class over a subject class. It is necessary that the Revolution conquer this state, transform it into a new state of the masses necessary in the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism.

The revolutionary Socialists in Germany, accordingly, struggle to destroy the bourgeois state—and it makes not a particle of difference how "democratic" and "Socialistic" that state may be—by means of the new state of the revolutionary masses, the unified Soviets. This means annihilating the bureaucracy, annihilating the police, annihilating the army, and centralizing all necessary police and army functions in the armed people itself, until unnecessary.

The class consciousness of the masses must be transformed into action and class power; and the arming of the masses is the form of expression of this transformation, the instrument for conquering the bourgeoisie and crushing counter-revolutionary maneuvers.

The German army is returning home, and must be demobilized. What shall be done with the arms? The demobilized soldier should retain his arms and become an armed civilian, a unit of the armed people. The workers who have not been at the front should equally secure arms,—and this is still more necessary and important. If this is not done, the state will possess an armed power since a part of the soldiers are not demobilized, and this "standing army" would become the instrument of counter-revolutionary action against the masses, who would be helpless, unarmed, dispersed by the armed power of the counter-revolutionary government.

Instead of an army, the armed people; instead of an army to "maintain order"—euphemism for counter-revolution—the armed masses themselves directly usurping the functions of the army and the police for purposes of revolutionary action and progress, maintaining the revolutionary order of the masses, not a counter-revolutionary "order" over the masses.

The proletariat alone is the revolutionary force, the proletariat alone may wage the uncompromising struggle for the overthrow of Capitalism, the proletariat alone is the maker and the preserver of the Revolution; and it is necessary that this proletariat shall be armed, that it shall itself directly, consciously, energetically and dynamically, constitute the state, the army, the police and the judiciary, shall itself usurp and discharge the functions of the "state." This alone is the straight and sure path to completing the proletarian revolution in Germany, as in Russia.

That the proletarian revolution in Germany is far from having conquered, is proven by one circumstance: the officers of the old regime are still at the head of the army, still issue orders and commands, precisely as those two political hacks of the old regime, Dr. Solf and Dr. Erzberger, issue orders and statements in the name of the "Socialistic, democratic" government of Ebert, Haase & Co. This fact indicates that the revolution is not yet complete, and indicates equally a threat for the future: the army, under counter-revolutionary control, may at any moment engage in counter-revolutionary action. Agitating among the soldiers and the masses, arousing their class consciousness by means of propaganda, is absolutely necessary; but it is absolutely necessary also, that this consciousness realize itself in po-

wer, and this power is comprised in the armament of the proletariat. The whole army will never be converted to the revolution; a standing army necessarily would be under the control of the counter-revolutionary government; and unless the masses arm, the danger of a counter-revolution becomes acute. Hence the demand of the revolutionary Socialists in Germany, as in Russia, for the armed revolutionary proletariat, for the workers' Red Guard.

That the army is already being used for counter-revolutionary purposes in Germany is indicated in the charge made by the Spartacus Socialists that the Junker stronghold at Thorn is concentrating royalist troops, who demanded free entrance into the fortress and the removal of red flags.

"The situation is extremely serious," declares the Spartacus proclamation. "Only ruthless energy and the firmest measures can save the situation. But the Government stands with folded arms, and even encourages these criminal rebels by circulating imaginary stories of Bolshevik conspiracies, at the same time lending its arm to the strangulation of the revolution by leaving the command of the troops to its enemies."

"The people themselves must rise and wrest power from unscrupulous officers. We demand that the Government at once arrest Hindenburg and all reactionary officers, at once remove headquarters from Cassel to Berlin, and at once take measures to prevent these officers from entering of the country as commanders of troops."

This is an acute danger to the revolution, a danger becoming all the more acute in the measure that the bourgeois-"Socialist" government and the criminal moderate Socialists palter with the issue. The necessity of arming the proletariat is not a problem of abstract theory, it is not a problem of annihilating the army because Socialism aspires after a society without an army,—it is a problem of the immediate, practical requirements of the Revolution, of completing the Revolution, of crushing the counter-revolution, and of developing the consciousness and might of the proletariat to seize all power—and without this seizure of power by the proletariat the German Revolution will, immediately at least, become a tragic expression of unrealized expectations.

"All power to the Soviets" is the necessary revolutionary program in Germany; this would constitute the organization of a new state, on the model of the Paris Commune and the Soviet Republic in Russia. The arming of the proletariat is an absolutely indispensable measure of such a State.

Counter-Revolutionary Socialism in Poland

THE newspapers recently reported that the new "revolutionary" government of Poland is headed by a veteran of the Polish Socialist movement in Galicia, the editor of the Crakow "Naishpoda"—Ignatz Dashinsky, while the commander-in-chief of the troops is General Joseph Pilsudsky. The same dispatches tell us that Polish troops crossed the Prussian border and occupied Poznan, capital of the former Great Duchy of Poznan. That the new Polish government will try to extend its influence over the three parts of Poland (Austrian, Russian and German) there can be little doubt. The success of such an attempt is very probable, and very likely, we are at the present moment witnessing the eve of the actual restoration of all parts of the former Kingdom of Poland.

The New York capitalist press, and following it the New York "Call," claim that the new Polish government is not only a revolutionary government, but also Socialist. Is it so?

Dashinsky and Pilsudsky are members of the extreme right wing of the Polish Socialist movement. Their movement corresponds to the Western European social-patriotism and petty bourgeois Socialism, and to the right wing in Russia as represented by Menshevism. This single circumstance ought to keep us from expressing too much enthusiasm concerning the "socialistic character" of the new government of Ignatz Dashinsky.

The Polish Socialist movement is divided into three parts. The fighting representative of the Polish proletariat is the Polish Bolshevik Social Democracy, under the leadership of Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Radek and Pyshky. The Polish Social Democracy has all along conducted a struggle against romantic nationalism in the Polish Socialist movement and against the exponents of that nationalism who controlled the Galician Socialist party. It has always pointed out that Polish Socialist nationalism is not only an outgrowth of the epoch when the petty nobility reigned in Poland, but very often has become chauvinistic and anti-Semitic. It goes without saying, then, that Polish Bolshevism should not be represented in the Dashinsky's Cabinet.

Dashinsky and the Galician Social Democracy have always been the exponents of co-operation with the bourgeoisie. In the early days of the war, Dashinsky together with the "radical" bourgeoisie, organized Polish legions to "fight Czarism." The leader of these legions, under Austrian military command, was Joseph Pilsudsky. The Polish legions were the connecting link which united the Polish social-patriots with the imperialists of the Central Powers. Dashinsky's party dropped its anchor into the muddy pool of Scheidemann's social-patriotism and betrayal of Socialism. The Crakow "Naishpoda" differed very little from the Vienna "Arbeiter Zeitung" and the Berlin "Vorwaerts" in chauvinism and support of the imperialistic war, fought for "democracy" against "Russian barbarism." And in the early days it was natural that the movement led by Dashinsky during the war had nothing to do whatever with international Socialism.

It has been pointed out above that Polish Bolshevism has always conducted a theoretical struggle against the Polish social-patriotism. However,

not only the Bolsheviks were arrayed against the latter. The left wing of the Polish Socialist party (the left P. P. S.) also disagreed with Dashinsky and Pilsudsky. It also on several occasions reproved the party's romanticism and chauvinism. We, however, are not in a position at present to judge the present relations of the left wing towards the new Polish government.

The adherents of Dashinsky and Pilsudsky in America are being grouped around the Chicago "Dzenik Ludovi". These gentlemen do not even belong to the Socialist party. They have wholly imbibed the imperialist "philosophy" of Russell, Spargo & Co. The adherents of war against Czarism in the early days of the war, their organizations later developed into appendages of the Allies—how concepts of democracy alter!

Therefore, we take the liberty to warn over enthusiastic comrades inclined to believe the reports of the telegraph agencies about the "Socialistic spirit" of the government of the former Polish-German-Allyed legionnaires. They are anti-Bolshevik. They are social-patriots and nationalists, necessarily petty bourgeois and counter-revolutionary. If they should unite with the bourgeoisie—and this is more than likely—then Poland would become the willing tool of international Imperialism.

P. S. The latest reports from Europe state that the personnel of the Polish government has changed. The premier is now Pilsudsky. There is mention of L. Vasilovsky. All this, however, does not change the substance of the general idea emphasized in this article. The Polish government continues to remain in the hands of the right wing of the Polish Socialist movement.

Aspects of the Coming Peace

ALTHOUGH the final settlement of the problems arising out of the war rests with men very much different from those about to assemble at Versailles, yet there is no doubt that the next few chapters of the world's history will be colored, to a large extent, by the results of the Peace Conference. It is commonly assumed by the bourgeois press of the Allied countries that the most pressing problem confronting the Peace Council is the nature of the terms to be imposed on Germany; but unless the delegates delve much deeper into the causes of the war than the consideration of the relative guilt of the nations involved—or the total guilt of Germany—and the nature of the punishment to be meted out, they will have failed to accomplish anything of even immediate value to the world. No mere rearrangement of the map of Europe, renaming of the outlying stretches of the world's surface that were Germany's colonies, fixing of the amount to be collected from the vanquished, after the manner of a Domestic Relations' Court settling a squabble over the ownership of the household effects, can settle the problems at present confronting the world.

The real issue facing the Allies at the Peace Conference is not Germany's fate,—that is being shaped by the German people; but the fate of their own nations. It is true that the Allies can dictate to Germany in the same sense as the Germans were able to dictate to Russia at Brest-Litovsk—whether the progress of the revolution in Germany will pursue a comparatively peaceful path, facing only the opposition forces within, or whether it shall tread the stormy way of strife at home complicated by semi-international war— but beyond that the real course of events in the erstwhile Central Empires lies with the awakened proletariat.

Russia, at the present moment, presents much more of a problem to the Allies than does Germany. Germany has been the enemy, Russia has been an ally, in fact the member of the Allies who has contributed most in sacrifice of life to the war, and it is by the actions of the Associated Powers towards the Russian Proletarian Government that their real purposes will be more clearly discernible to the proletariat of their own countries and will largely determine the actions of this proletariat.

Whether it is right or whether it is wrong, the present tendency of the masses is away from what has hitherto been known as patriotism. The fervent outbursts of nationalistic love and pride, shown in the sacrifices and devotion that have astonished mankind during the war, and the natural feeling of glory that these sacrifices have been crowned with victory, are by no means the real measure of the feelings of the masses. Hitherto the people have gone to war as a matter of course when the drum beat to battle, usually without having even the faintest notion of the why or the whereof of the conflict, but that is changed. The world has marched forward many steps while the guns thundered, and whereas in August 1914 scarcely one person in a hundred knew or cared anything about international affairs, now the great majority of the common people are taking an intense interest in the relations of nation to nation.

The people of the Allied countries have fought a victorious war, and more important, they have seen the coming of Social Revolution in Russia and Germany. They have seen kings topple from their thrones like overripe fruit from the trees in autumn, they have seen mighty autocracies blown away overnight by the breath of the common people, they have glimpsed in the mirror of their brothers' deeds their own power, they feel the hitherto latent strength beginning to pulse in their veins, they are dimly conscious of the fact that their's is the victory, their's the power, and they are enquiring more and more into their own status in society. They are asking, why?

At the peace table two definite factions will emerge. Not the factions of the erstwhile Central Empires on the one hand, and the Allies on the other—the pleading for mercy of the vanquished and the reply of the conqueror—these will, of course, appear and very much overdressed, strut the stage; nor will the division alone be along the lines of groups of national alliances

among the Allies themselves, groups squabbling about spheres of influence, these will also appear and play their part; but the real struggle at the peace table will be between the "conservatives" and the "liberals", the autocrats and the democrats, those who say "after us the deluge" and those who are concerned about the future status of capitalism. Between these two factions the great struggle of the Peace Conference will center and it is upon the outcome of this struggle that the vivid pages of the immediate future will be written.

Outside the halls of the council chamber is another power—the awakened proletariat—whose actions will be determined by the result within. This power, the new "third estate", is the coming dominant force, the herald of the new age. If the conservatives prevail at the peace table then the clarion call to the final battle will sound and the next few years will see "whirlwinds of rebellion shake the world", but if the liberal forces triumph then the call will be delayed and the final transition from Capitalism to Socialism may even take a less violent form. In this sense the Peace Conference will determine the course of events, though it cannot control the final outcome.

But while the real issue of the peace conference lies in the class struggle and the final division will be along the lines of the "conservative" and "liberal" attitude towards the proletariat, the minor and apparently more immediate issues, though perhaps bringing a scattering of these forces, will generally follow the same tendency. The "conservatives" will insist on a "woe to the conquered" policy in dealing with the central European countries, and will then themselves split on a nationalistic basis over the apportionment of the spoils of victory. They will form and counterform entangling alliances over trade routes, spheres of influences, and will necessarily have to re-split again on the question of national armaments, each insisting on the maximum military and naval machine for his own particular nationality.

If the "conservative" forces of the Conference carries the day international wars can hardly be averted before the present armies have time to demobilize. They will cut up territory with regard only to their own particular economic interests, putting race against race and burdening their own and foreign peoples with debts, almost certainly they will immediately wage war against the Socialist states and will precipitate world revolution either out of the fresh wars or out of the misery of their own peoples consequent on the enormous expenditures for armaments.

If on the other hand the "liberal" forces win, they will endeavor to placate the masses of their own countries, they will attempt to rearrange Europe along racial lines, as far as is possible in accord with their particular economic interests, they will endeavor to effect a League of Nations with the purpose of gradually reducing armaments or at least preventing their increase. In dealing with the conquered peoples the indications are that the "liberals" will attempt to enforce only such indemnities as can be paid without extreme hardship or collected without the probability of causing armed resistance, they will try to fit trade privileges to the circumstances and attempt to apportion the receipt of indemnity on an equitable basis.

The League of Nations will in all probability only eventuate if the "liberals" are successful and even then it is very much open to question whether it can be made workable, even for a time. If a split occurs in the liberal forces it will be on this question which is the central idea of the "liberal" ideology. Already there are indications that the "freedom of the seas" will form one of the chief points of difference between the Allies and the "freedom of the seas" is absolutely essential to the establishment of a League of Nations as it is obvious that no such league can function while the waterways of the world are controlled by one nation. Sea power is the key to foreign trade success, and foreign trade, or more specifically the export of capital, investment markets, protectorates and undeveloped territory generally, is absolutely essential to the continuance of Capitalism in the present highly developed state of the world. In times of peace foreign markets may be open to all competitors but without naval power no foreign market can be considered in any sense

secure when with the outbreak of war one nation can cut communications. The so-called "rights of neutrals" are in reality non-existent, the privileges of neutrals, in respect to foreign trade at least, lie in the hands of the dominant sea power.

Freedom of the seas means in effect naval disarmament and naval disarmament will necessitate freedom of the land which means the disbanding of armies. But even if this question could be patched up by means of rules and regulations, for, of course, there is no intention even among the most liberal "liberals" of bringing about total disarmament, history shows that immediately the necessity is strong enough the regulations and rules would be broken by the stronger powers and the League of Nations would end in another world war.

Furthermore a League of Nations, to effect anything like what its advocates claim for it, must be a league of all nations, and at the present moment there are among the bigger nations one Socialist state and another on the verge of becoming Socialist. The former of these states, Russia, would apparently not be invited into this league because even now, the Allies are in a state of semi-war with Russia and the latter, Germany, could hardly be invited in because she is just now in the nature of an unknown quantity, consequently if all the other nations, great and small, became members of the league and Russia and Germany were left out they would be forced into the position of outlaws and instead of avoiding wars the league would necessarily cause war.

With regard to the rearrangement of the map of Europe more unity can be expected among the "liberals" than among the "conservatives" but even here difficulties must arise over the small nationalities and the present tendency seems to be to endeavor to grant the requests of the small races outside of the Allied countries and leave the question of the subject nationalities within these countries alone, thus half settling this problem which in itself contains the germs of future wars.

Moreover, where the question of the small nationalities will be taken up at all, happenings in Austria, Hungary and the Balkans show that such a question cannot be settled without leaving ranking sores somewhere, and it is already evident that arbitrary decisions are going to have a worse effect than no decision at all. The only chance, with regard to the small and subject peoples, of any sort of a peaceful settlement is on the basis of the people concerned deciding for themselves, and this cannot be generally put into practice, as very naturally these small peoples would not consider such important questions, from the viewpoint of the great powers, as, for instance, the balance of power. No matter what good intentions may actuate the "liberals" in dealing with the small nations, the fact remains that it is the interests of the big nations that will decide the fate of the small and not such abstract things as justice, liberty and right.

The idea behind the formation of a League of Nations is the creation of some sort of international court that will be able to combine the functions of judge, jury and police, but even the bourgeois liberal conception of courts recognizes that there can be no justice where the court has a personal interest in the dispute. Any question coming before a League of Capitalist Nations must necessarily affect very definitely the interests of the jurors, as it is now admitted that nations do not live by themselves alone, but as part of the whole group and that everything affecting the group must affect the individual nation. This fact in itself, will sooner or later cause one of the disputants to reject the decision of the league and then the only course open will be an appeal to arms with the result that what might have merely developed into a local war will become a world war of even greater magnitude than that which the Peace Conference is trying to settle.

In any event whether the "conservatives" or "liberals" gain the ascendancy Capitalism will still remain in power; the war will not have solved the fundamental problems that produced it, bringing instead new and more intricate problems; and the intervention of the third power—the proletariat—will become still more imperative to realize the longings of the masses for permanent peace and a new civilization.

Wages and High Prices in Russia

By M. Bronsky

From the Moscow "Pravda"

ONE of the most important questions in the economic life of a country is that relating to the struggle against the high cost of living. The wages of the workers do not keep pace with the high cost of living which is moving forward with terrific speed. No matter how much wages are increased the price of the articles of prime necessity increase much more swiftly. The increase of wages is not moving parallel with the growth of high prices, but it moves by jumps, under the pressure of struggle, strikes, threats and all sorts of administrative demands.

During the period of eight months of the bourgeois revolution in Russia, the workers obtained a number of changes in the scale of wages, and in this manner they met the high cost of living; they tried to insure themselves against a return to the old, terrible conditions of labor and wages by "tying" the capitalist with "regulations" for a definite period of time.

But the "regulative" contracts are of value only when the prices on the products of consumption are more or less stable. As soon, however, as this stability disappears, when prices on bread, meat, butter, wood, rooms, clothes, shoes, and other necessary articles are changed not daily but hourly, then these "regulative" contracts become obsolete and insufficient before the expiration of the time limit, and they appear to be only an obstacle in the struggle of the workers, rather than a weapon for curbing the capitalists. This brings a condition where, in spite of the contracts, the workers, here and there, demand an increase in wages in order to prevent their condition of life becoming worse.

It is clear, then, that to fight the high cost of living one must choose another path, and the increase of wages at the present time, a time of paper-currency, does not guarantee the worker from the high cost of living. The oftener the wage changes, the more influence it has on speculation, on the increase of merchandise prices and it would have required a most strict and exact regulation of fixed prices in order that the increase of wages should not effect, in its turn, the worker as a consumer, in the form of an avalanche of high prices on all products of consumption.

The increase in wages because of the paper-currency circulation, the tendency of a sudden drop in the rate of the ruble, does not increase proportionally its purchasing power. As a matter of fact, the continuous jump in the high cost of living is chiefly the result of the dropping in the value of the ruble. The other side of this drop in the value of the ruble is speculation, the struggle against which must go simultaneously with other means of fighting the high cost.

And to fight high prices one must proceed from two ends at once: by raising the value of the ruble, its stability, and, on the other end, by the increase of real wages.

It is necessary, in short, to try to make things so that one could get more products for a ruble and that wages should not only be given in paper tender, but represent real purchasing power.

It is clear that this program of fighting high prices cannot merely go on within the boundaries

of one factory, or one city, but is an economic program on an all-Russian scale.

We have already pointed out that to raise the value of a ruble can be only achieved by increasing the mass of products in the merchandise market.

And this is why the ruble drops in its purchasing power, because having been forced to issue paper rubles during the war in great quantity, we at the same time used up a great mass of products in the war.

Even now we shall be compelled to issue paper money, but our economic problem is the production of merchandise, necessary not for war, but for the requirements of the country. If these hundreds of thousands of workmen who work in the war factories, will begin to produce products for consumption or machines, which lighten labor and increase the productivity of labor; if these millions of soldiers who are listed in the armies, will return to productive labor,—then the value of the ruble will rise. For only then the supply of merchandise will be increased in comparison with the demand, only then will those who purchase products also be in some degree the producers of these products.

Thus, the most substantial means of fighting high prices, that is, to fight the decrease of the purchasing power of the ruble, is the increase of the country's productivity, by means of increase in the number of persons working on productive needs of the people's economy.

It is understood, that this path is long, and that one cannot expect in the near future apparent results. But this is the only path leading to the goal.

But the workers cannot wait. Their wage scale established a few months ago, can scarcely meet the systematic rise in the prices of products of first necessity.

It is necessary to take extraordinary measures, in order, on the one hand, to safeguard the workers' families against a lack of products of prime necessity, and on the other hand, protect the country against industrial disorganization.

Especially now, political power is in the hand of the proletariat and peasantry, it would be folly and incompetence for the proletarian government to allow the closing of factories and plants, lock-outs and strikes, as a means of the economic struggle of the proletariat.

The strike is a method of struggle of the proletariat in bourgeois society, is a means of compelling the capitalists to make concessions, under the threat of holding up the source of profits—a method which costs the worker very dearly, and affects the whole of society. If the government now is in the hands of representatives of the working class, and if the class interests of the workers coincide with the interests of the whole of society, it would have been a crime on the part of the proletarian government to let the workers defend their interests by the costly and difficult way of strikes—the way of closing the factories.

We are face to face with the problem of solving the high cost of living from an absolutely differ-

ent angle; owing to the unreality of the increase in wages it is necessary to provide the workers with these products which compose the greater part of expenditure in the budget of the worker's family.

In the first place are the expenses of subsistence: bread, meat, potatoes, butter, etc.; further, the expenses for room rent, heating and lighting; then follow the expenses for clothing, shoes, underwear, etc.; and then expenses for cultural needs: schools, newspapers, books, medicines, etc. Thus, the nominal wage of the workers is divided into its component parts and must cover all the above-named expenses. If, instead, part of the money-wages is paid to the workers in products for which they spend their wages, and on the rest of the products to establish fixed prices,—then as a matter of fact the nominal rise of wages measured in rubles can be stopped, increasing its real power, and providing the workers with products of prime necessity. By organizing public restaurants for all categories of workers and their families, it is possible not only to lessen the burden on the workers' wives in preparing breakfasts, dinners and suppers (economy of labor and fuel); but it is possible to provide their subsistence and in fact to raise the purchasing power of that part of wages which is being spent for subsistence. The public lunch rooms which can be established at the factories, or in the working quarters, can actually increase wages materially, and not simply nominally in rubles.

In this manner could be solved the question of rent. Here, more radical means will have to be employed. The expenses for rent are going directly into the pockets of landlords who collect from the tenants the rents on the capital invested in building the house. This is one of the sources of the capitalist's profit, which less than anything else has the right to exist. The question of nationalization or municipalization of houses is a question of the near future. The moratorium on the rents is only a temporary measure and must give way to municipalization of the houses and State monopoly of the city real estate. By instituting socialization (municipalization) of houses, we, in this way, decrease that part of the wages which is being expended for rent. Simultaneously with this the income of city and State will be increased (rents considerably lessened go to the city and State treasures); in this way the city and the State will be able to put into life such institutions (free schools, dispensaries, theatres, museums and so forth), which, in their turn, absorb great sums from the wages of the workers.

Only in this way is it possible to fight the high cost of living.

As a necessary form of the transition period and as a means of fighting speculation, it is necessary to establish fixed prices not only on the chief products of food, but also on products of consumption in general.

In a word, the struggle against the high cost of living by the proletarian-peasant government cannot tread the old path of increasing the nominal wage, but it must follow the path of establishing a real wage by providing all the working masses with the necessary means of consumption.

The Class Character of Bourgeois Mercy

By N. I. Hourwich

THE meaning of life to Mooney is still—prison! "Clemency" means a living death—to an innocent man!

Could we expect anything better from capitalist "justice"? Of course not! For the release of Mooney, or even a new trial of his case, would be at the same time a verdict of "guilty" for the whole system of "capitalist justice." A new trial, on the eve of the execution of the death sentence, would mean putting on trial all those who, during two and a half years, kept Mooney in prison, energetically denying him justice, and who for a long time tried to fasten the noose around his neck, and would have succeeded had it not been for the intervention of organized labor, in America as well as in other countries. Granting a new trial would mean "undermining the foundations of law and order," and not a single defender of "law and order" would, of course venture upon such a sacrilegious task.

Two and a half years ago Capitalism, with the aid of its mercenary agents and lackeys, wrenched Mooney from the ranks of the fighters in the cause of labor. And now the same predatory interests favor "clemency" for Mooney—and the purpose is the same—striking at labor.

The Governor of California, in granting "cle-

mency" to Mooney, declares he ventured on that act of "mercy" upon the "urgent requests" of President Wilson. But President Wilson has more than once appealed to the Governor to pardon Mooney, and the last request of this character was sent as far back as March of last year. A question arises, then, why has California's Governor met the request of President Wilson just on the eve of a threatened general strike throughout the land? Are we not justified in suspecting that the threat of a general strike and not the "urgent requests" of President Wilson has been the whip that lashed the "merciful" governor on to act?

True, the Governor, foreseeing the possibility of such "unfounded" suspicions, attempts to produce some sort of explanation of his tardiness. But the "explanations" are so empty that they will convince no one.

In order to do away finally with any "unfounded" suspicions regarding the true character of the matter, the Governor solemnly declares that he "refuses to recognize this case as in any fashion representing a clash between capital and labor." But if this is so, if the Mooney case is one of the thousands of ordinary "criminal cases" having

nothing in common with the struggle between labor and capital, the question arises: Why did President Wilson in the letters to Gov. Stephens printed in the papers, constantly allude to the "international significance" of the Mooney case.

What, one may ask, is the international significance attached to the pardoning or, on the contrary, the sentencing of an "ordinary criminal" as Governor Stephens is picturing Mooney?

And what a pigmy is this unfortunate governor who attempts with all sorts of absurd-comical assurances and caricature "grand" gestures to get rid of that indisputable fact of life—that it was not the requests of any sort from above, but the working classes, their just and severe wrath, which stopped the hand of the executioner.

But, of course, the working class will not be deceived by this tawdry act of "mercy"—a bone thrown to the dog. The workers' threat of a general strike, the evident determination to immediately begin to act, only owing to this did they succeed in wresting this act of "mercy" from the strong claws of the capitalist Cerberus. And the working class will not stop at that; with energy multiplied by this first victory, the working class will continue the struggle, until Mooney shall be set free and return to the ranks of the fighters in the cause of labor from which he was snatched.

Chapters from My Diary

By Leon Trotzky

iv
Entering France. — Paris. — Viviani. — Joffre. —
Briand. — Clemenceau.

NOVEMBER 19, 1914, I crossed the French boundary. Already there were many wounded all over, and Red Cross Sisters were at the doors of the cars with collection boxes. Everyone had a feeling that the war would end not later than the Spring, although no one could precisely say why. Simple humanity had not yet come to the point of regarding war as the normal condition of affairs.

Paris was sad: the hotels were closed, and by no means all the persons who had fled from the city in August had as yet returned; the streets were plunged in darkness at night, the cafes closed at 8 P. M. "What is the explanation for this last step?" I asked the people who knew. "That's very simple; General Gallieni, the Governor of Paris, does not wish to have any gathering of crowds. In times like these, the cafes might very easily become, in the evenings the centres of criticism and of dissatisfaction among the laboring classes, which are kept busy by day."

All over there were many women in black. In the first days, when the proudly patriotic mood was still upon them, mourning was worn not only by mothers and wives, but even by rather distant relatives. The children played at war all over, and many had been dressed in army uniforms by their mothers. Convalescent wounded soldiers, with fresh crosses on their breasts, swarmed in all the streets. In respectful, almost flattering conversation with them stood old men, who were not only patriotic, but sometimes physically able, in whose lapsels were the ribbons of the Legion of Honor. There are a lot of them in Paris, these indomitable advocates of a "war jusqu'au bout" who in 1870 were too young to serve and now are too old.

At times there were Zeppelins. I remember a night in December (1914), when I was returning home through streets that were in semi-darkness. From one direction, later from another, there were trumpet blasts that were terrifying to the last degree. Dark shadows rushed by, and one by one the street lanterns, covered by screens across the top, were put out. A few minutes later the streets were absolutely dark, and not a soul in them. I did not understand at all, although I had an idea that something interesting was going on.

Suddenly there was a dull roar, then another—nearer, a third—again more distant. It became clear that there was a bombardment: were the shots fired from the ground upward, or out of the air downward? That is, were the canons shooting in order to fight off invisible Zeppelins, or were these cruisers of the air dropping explosive shells?

I learned later that both these things had been going on at once. Half an hour later the searchlight on the Eiffel Tower began to pierce the clouds. Once more in my hotel, I was confronted with an unusual tableau: all the time inmates were sitting on the steps of the winding staircase reading, conversing, or playing cards by the light

of tallow candles. It was strictly prohibited to turn on the electric light in the rooms. From my window in the fifth story I had an indistinct sensation of the city that was in hiding beneath me. Distant explosions were twice heard again. The searchlights ceaselessly played over the clouds. Early in the morning we again heard the trumpet blasts, this time stormy and jovous; the enemy had been put to flight, you might turn on your cellars might with impunity mount the staircase to their rooms. The morning after that, the papers announced in what parts of the city houses had been destroyed, and how many human victims there had been.

At the head of the French Government at the beginning of the war stood the rather colorless phrasemaker Viviani, who had formerly been a Socialist and a pupil of Jaures. In fact, the French bourgeoisie seems to make a practice of entrusting the most responsible government posts to the Socialists of yesterday. The French Radicals, are for the most part distinguished by their over-zeal to constitute the principal party of the Republic, narrow and provincial petit-bourgeois outlook, which would prevent them from guiding the world interests of the French Rouse. A lawyer who has gone through the school of Socialism, and who knows what manner of speech to use toward the working masses, is much more adaptable to the complicated politics of the present day,—on the condition, of course, that this lawyer is prepared to sell his conscience, so to speak, to Capitalism for a sufficient consideration. Another former Socialist, Briand, once an exponent of the general strike, held the position of Minister of Justice in the Viviani Ministry. Briand assumed an attitude of unconcealed skepticism toward the head of his ministry, openly criticized the reactionary devices of his chief in the corridors of the Chamber, and did not a little toward preparing the downfall of his friend and superior in this way.

The prestige of Joffre, at this moment, just after the Battle of the Marne, by which the advance of the Germans had been stopped, had reached its highest point. The entire press could not sreak of him without ruminations, and referred to the Parliament of the Republic with Bonapartist contemptuousness, as to a body of windmills, with no useful function in the world. The reactionary depths were boiling with active preparations for a great coup d'etat. Negotiations were being carried on with the chief newspaper of France "Le Temps", in this connection and reports concerning them were a matter of every-day gossip. As far as words merely were concerned, the Bonapartist coup d'etat was already in the air. But, to reduce the hare to a ragout, as the French proverb puts it, it is necessary, first of all, to have your hare: that is just what was lacking: for you cannot have a Bonapartist coup d'etat without a Bonaparte.

At any rate, hardly anyone could have been less appropriate for this role than "Papa Joffre." His

guarded and cautious character, the absence of any ideal spark, made him a precise opposite to the great genius of French military tradition, Napoleon. In the domain of strategy, Joffre is a precise counterpart of the conservative and narrow French petite bourgeoisie, which is afraid of taking any step that involves any risk. After the Battle of the Marne (the credit for which is ascribed by many not to Joffre, but to Gallieni), the military prestige of the generalissimo began to go down, at first gradually, later with great swiftness. Nor did the French army discover another eagle to succeed him. Of new victories and of new glories there were none. The chances for a military coup d'etat naturally went by the board.

In fact, there are no "eagles" in the military life of France at the present time. On the contrary, never has mediocrity prevailed with such undisputed sway in the Third Republic, as at the present tragic epoch. The greatest man whom the French bourgeoisie has managed to attract to a position of leadership is Aristide Briand. Without possessing a single dominating "national" idea, without the most necessary guiding principles of statesmanship or morality, a past master in the art of wire-pulling, a trafficker in the lost souls of the French Parliament, an indicator of bribery and corruption, a prestidigitator with the manners of a political gristmill, Aristide Briand is, in his every quality, a complete caricature of the "greatness" of the "national" war for "liberation".

The most formidable opponent of Briand is the old undoer of ministries, the "titan" of French radicalism, the seventy-five-year-old Clemenceau. The impelling force of his great publicistic talent is that of malice. Clemenceau is too well acquainted with all the inside wire-pulling of French politics to cherish any illusions as to its possessing any idealistic motives. He is too evil to permit such illusions to remain unstained in others. Clemenceau did more than any other person to prick the inflated reputations of those who led the nation's war: of Poincare, President of the Republic, of Joffre, Commander-in-Chief, and of the head of the Briand Ministry. Yet the same Clemenceau that constituted a chip of Jacobinism in the reign of capitalist finance, utterly lacked any sort of "constructive" policy. He demands a tenfold exertion of forces to wage war to the end. Yet he knows the secret of success as little as does anyone else. And if his destructive criticism of the uninspired and deceptive and timid policy of Briand should bring about the downfall of the latter, it is hardly likely that the French Parliament will decide to summon as his successor the great "disintegrator," Georges Clemenceau.

P. S. — After the above lines were written, the fall of the Briand Cabinet and the formation of a new Cabinet became accomplished facts. Clemenceau has been passed over. At the head of the Cabinet was placed the aged Ribot, the conservative, somewhat "leftish" in tendencies, who has no definite ideas on the questions connected with the war. I should say that the Cabinet of Ribot is the Cabinet of fruitless waiting.

They Have Started to Quarrel

By Gregory Weinstein

Whether or not the German fleet will be sunk, future events will show. But the rumor itself is characteristic. It shows that among the Allies great differences are developing and that these differences threaten to break the unity of the Allied diplomatic front at the peace conference.

Clashes are expected not only among individual states in Europe, but also between Europe and America. In this connection, the representative of the Baltimore "Sun," just returned from the other side, says:

"The truth is, and everybody in Paris knows it, that in governmental and political circles they do not love us at all over there, neither the English nor the French. . . . Some disposition to resent anything like American domination or the sneaking of America in a strong voice at the peace table is already manifesting itself in an undercurrent of criticism of our army staff, and a tendency to minimize somewhat our effort in the war."

What is the reason for England's unfriendliness towards America? An answer to this question can be found in the following extract from the same article by the representative of the Baltimore "Sun":

"Great Britain wants a just peace all right, but she wants Great Britain to be the policeman

with the club to enforce this peace, and she is preparing to cling to her position as the dominant sea power of the world as she clings to life. If England is to continue the maintenance of a great fleet it will force us into the maintenance of a great fleet. . . . That sort of thing, it is argued, is not the way to peace. It is the way that logically, in the long run, leads to the other thing. . . . A little concerned already about the merchant marine now building in the United States, the suggestion that the American nation may be forced to compete with Great Britain in the size of its navy, certainly "gets the wind up" with the average Englishman. He knows perfectly well that his country is in no condition financially to stand the kind of competition the United States would give if forced."

Such is the case with England. And France has her own interests. She, as testified by the representative of the Baltimore "Sun," is interested in expanding her territory at the expense of Germany, and in obtaining, at least, a part of the German colonies. As for Italy, her territorial appetite is notorious. England and France are very much "disappointed" in Italy. She helped very little in the war, but instead, by threatening to leave the Allies, she demanded and secured from the latter men and money.

THE Peace Conference is not yet in session, but "night errands of democracy and the self-determination of nationalities" are quarreling among themselves. The information concerning this quarrel, which recently assumed scandalous forms, is just beginning to creep into the American Press. The European military censorship does not allow information to pass freely, and only persons arriving here from Europe as newspaper representatives begin to inform public opinion in the United States concerning the serious "differences" among the Allies. The scandal has come so far that it is no longer possible to pass it in silence.

A few days ago the newspapers printed a report that the Allies are very much dissatisfied with Italy. It appears that Italy violates the armistice terms, and not waiting for the decisions of the coming peace conference, seizes Austrian territory which, according to the terms, do not belong to Italy. And following this a sensational rumor penetrates the press about the "Solomon" decision which was apparently adopted by the Allies concerning the question of disposition of the German warships. If we are to believe these rumors, the Allies decided to sink the German fleet that was surrendered to avoid "misunderstandings" which might arise when the time for dividing it up should come.

A Problem in Tactics

By Louis C. Fraina

THE great fact of contemporary history is the proletarian revolution in action. This great fact, the affirmation in life of the theory of Socialism, is now deciding the destiny of the proletariat, and of the world.

And the great fact of contemporary Socialism is that this proletarian revolution proceeds by means of an implacable struggle between Socialism and Socialism, between mutually exclusive conceptions of Socialism.

The uncritical Socialist rhapsodizes over the coming of Socialism in Russia, over the "Socialist" Republic in Germany: Socialism is conquering! But which Socialism—what conception of Socialism?

The proletarian revolution is in action in Germany, has been for one year and a half in action in Russia; and the most unrelenting enemy of this revolution, the enemy behind whom skulks the forces of Capitalism and reaction, is Socialism itself, or rather that "majority" Socialism which dominated the International before the war and betrayed Socialism during the war by transforming itself into an ally of social-Imperialism.

In developing its action against Capitalism and Imperialism the revolutionary proletariat met a staggering surprise—the opposition of Socialism. Shaken by the impact of revolutionary events, and verging on collapse, Capitalism built its last line of defense—an alliance with the moderate, opportunistic "majority" Socialism. The real struggle in Russia, the real struggle in Germany now, is not between Socialism and Capitalism, but between Socialism and "Socialism," between revolutionary "minority" Socialism and petty bourgeois "majority" Socialism. The proletarian revolution against Capitalism and Imperialism is equally a revolution against the old moderate, petty bourgeois Socialism: the decisive phase of the Revolution and the decisive phase in the coming reconstruction of international Socialism—a fact which the American Socialist press either completely ignores or camouflages.

In Russia, in March, 1917, Czarism was overthrown and a bourgeois republic organized. Immediately antagonism developed between bourgeois and proletarian, between Capitalism and Socialism. Shaken by revolutionary proletarian action, by the determination of the proletariat to break through the breach created in the old order for action and the conquest of power, the bourgeoisie concluded an alliance with moderate Socialism, with the "Socialism" of Chaidze, Plekhanov, Tsereteli, the Socialism of the Mensheviks and the Social-Revolutionary Party. What was this Socialism? In substance, in tactics, ideology and immediate purposes, it was identical with the majority Socialism that dominated the International before the war, that betrayed the International during the war (and which is still dominant, except in Russia, Germany and Italy.) It was this Socialism that was dominant in Russia before the Revolution, that captured the imagination of the Socialists of the world, that was considered the real expression of the Russian Socialist movement. This Socialism concluded an alliance with the bourgeoisie, by means of a "coalition government;" it opposed the coming of the proletarian revolution, acted by all means in its power against the revolutionary proletariat. After the proletarian revolution, in spite of all, conquered power, after a new Socialist state of the unified Soviets was organized, this "majority" Socialism stayed in the opposition, and elements of it, such as Maslov and Tchaikovsky, made agreements with international Imperialism for armed intervention—against the Soviet Republic, against the Russian masses, against the proletarian revolution! The decisive struggle in Russia was the struggle between revolutionary proletarian Socialism and moderate petty bourgeois Socialism.

A parallel course is being pursued by events in Germany. The "majority" Socialism of Scheidemann, Ebert & Co., of the Social-Democratic Party, of that party which before the war (and even now, in some quarters) was considered the exemplar of a Socialist Party, did all in its power to prevent action against the war and the government, to prevent the coming of a revolution; this "Socialism" intrigued against the proletarian revolution in Russia, trying to use it in the nationalistic interests of Germany, crushing the efforts of the masses to act in sympathy and solidarity with revolutionary Russia; and ten days before the mass action of the German proletariat flared up into the Revolution, this "majority" Socialism issued a proclamation against revolutionary action, against even strikes and demonstrations hostile to the government! But the revolution came; and now the "majority" Socialism of the Social-Democratic Party, the model of moderate Socialism everywhere, opposes the completion of the revolution, through its slavery to the petty bourgeois democracy of the Constituent As-

sembly it promotes Capitalism, tries to stultify the revolution within the limits of petty bourgeois action and reforms, is the real enemy of the revolution, the last line of defense of Imperialism and Capitalism in Germany. Simultaneously the pure (in type, but not in spirit) "Menshevik" Socialism of the "centre" Independent Socialists, of Haase & Co., acts equally against the revolution, by wavering between Scheidemann and Liebknecht, between petty bourgeois Socialism and proletarian Socialism. The democratic, parliamentary republic is organized in Germany; but instead of the struggle to transform this bourgeois republic into a Socialist republic, moderate Socialism, in Germany as in Russia, engages in the counter-revolutionary struggle to prevent this transformation!

Why?

All sorts of arguments are made to explain, or condone, the attitude of moderate Socialism in Russia. The war, say some: but why, now that the war is over, should moderate Socialism still act against the Soviet Republic? The Mensheviks and the Social-Revolutionists, say others, did not think a proletarian revolution could be accomplished; but why, after the revolution was accomplished, should the tendency of moderate Socialism still oppose the Soviet Republic, often in alliance with the bourgeois counter-revolution and international Imperialism? But the great argument of the Russian Mensheviks, and their petty bourgeois Socialist supporters everywhere, is that Russia was industrially undeveloped, economically unripe for Socialism, the proletariat not strong enough to make a proletarian revolution and introduce Socialism. Socialism, say these perverters of Marxism, requires a highly developed Capitalism, ignoring that the coming of Socialism implies a series of international revolutionary class struggles in which proletarian class power decides the issue. Revolutionary Socialism in Russia was determined not alone in a struggle for the proletarian revolution in Russia, but for the proletarian revolution in Germany, and in Europe. Still, considering Russia alone, there was a deceptive color of truth to the argument that industrially undeveloped Russia was not prepared for a proletarian revolution.

But now consider Germany. Germany, industrially, is the very antithesis of Russia. If any nation in the world is industrially prepared for Socialism, it is Germany: a completely industrialized unit, in which the peasantry is a minor factor and the industrial proletariat at least one-half the population. Germany is a small country, territorially, close-knit by concentrated industry, in which concentrated industry controls. It is inconceivable that industry in Germany itself, under Capitalism, could develop any greater measure of maturity. Even the perverters of Marxism would admit that Germany, objectively, is ready for Socialism. And yet, in spite of this difference with Russia, moderate petty bourgeois Socialism pursues in Germany the identical policy of moderate Socialism in Russia, is against the proletarian revolution, against Socialism in fact!

Why? It is clear, it is incontrovertible, considering the dissimilarity of industrial conditions in Russia and Germany, and the similarity in policy of moderate Socialism, that there must be a general policy, one fundamental tactic, that each possesses and which determines them in a counter-revolutionary course.

It is not a question of individuals, or of their personal motives and character; but of the tendency they represent.

What this fundamental tendency is, is apparent upon considering that the issue that split Socialism in Russia and in Germany was the issue of "All power to the Soviets!"—the issue of state power: the issue, the old bourgeois state or a new proletarian state?

The fundamental tendency of moderate Socialism, which is at the same time the cause and the effect of its petty bourgeois ideology, the bases of its compromising tactics and opportunism, and the reason it avoids the real industrial struggle and rejects mass action, is the conception that the coming of Socialism is a process of introducing measures of socialization on the basis of the bourgeois parliamentary state. Petty bourgeois, moderate Socialism considers the "democratic" parliamentary state as the centre of its activity, the instrument for the coming of Socialism. Parliamentary action is the decisive instrument of action: nationalize industry after industry, perfect the "democracy" of the state, secure a parliamentary majority—and then comes Socialism!

This policy, clearly, would determine moderate Socialism in Russia and in Germany in a struggle for the democratic parliamentary state. If the democratic state is the instrument for the introduction of Socialism, then the real struggle is to establish the democratic parliamentary state—which was precisely why moder-

ate Socialism in Russia and in Germany was dominantly interested in the parliamentary state, adherents of bourgeois democracy.

But this policy of moderate Socialism has another aspect—if the state and parliamentary action are considered decisive, then the "co-operation of classes" becomes imperative, Socialism becomes the concern of all the classes which must unite in the introduction of Socialism—which was precisely the policy formulated by the German Social-Democratic Party in its Wuerzburg convention in 1916. This circumstance develops the corrupt, compromising, counter-revolutionary ideology of moderate Socialism.

Out of this policy emerges necessary and relentless opposition to "All power to the Soviets!"—to a dictatorship of the proletariat. "All power to the Soviets!" implies a new state—but moderate Socialism believes the old parliamentary state is the instrument for the introduction of Socialism; proletarian Socialism implies the one-class state, that the introduction of Socialism is the concern of the proletariat and the proletariat alone—but moderate Socialism believes in the democratic state "of all the classes" and that the introduction of Socialism is the concern of all the classes, a process of class co-operation.

The fatal, un-proletarian character of this policy of moderate Socialism is not very apparent in normal times, except on the problem of unionism; but it becomes as clear as crystal in the Revolution, necessarily reveals its counter-revolutionary character. And all other defects of moderate Socialism are simply an expression of this fundamental tendency, this petty bourgeois policy.

Revolutionary Socialism, Marxism, completely repudiates the attitude of moderate Socialism on the problem of the state. Marxism projects, and revolutionary experience confirms, that the proletariat can not simply lay hold of the ready-made machinery of the bourgeois state and use it for its purposes: this machinery must be destroyed and a new state organized—the state of the organized producers, of proletarian dictatorship. Marxism conceives the introduction of Socialism as the process of one class, determined by the struggle of one class—the proletariat, all other classes, in the final test, are necessarily counter-revolutionary. It is imperative, accordingly, that the revolutionary proletariat annihilate the "democratic" state "of all the classes" in favor of the new proletarian state. And what is this new state? It is simply the state of the organized producers—the working class; dispensing with the reactionary parliamentary forms and fraudulent democracy of the bourgeois state. The bourgeois state is an instrument of class rule, the authority of one class over another, its army, police and bureaucracy instruments for the terrorism of the proletariat. It is upon the basis of this new industrial state, with industrial and not territorial constituencies, that Socialism can be introduced. The complete political expropriation of the bourgeois is the necessary preliminary to his complete economic expropriation. The first concern of the revolutionary proletariat, accordingly, is the conquest of the state power by mass action, the annihilation of the bourgeois parliamentary state, and the organization of a new proletarian state functioning temporarily as a dictatorship of the revolutionary proletariat. This state is the state of the organized producers—the state comprised in "all power to the Soviets!" Revolutionary Socialism in Germany and in Russia, instead of using the revolution, the breach in the old order, to "perfect" the "democratic" parliamentary state, used this breach for a larger and Socialist purpose—the destruction of this "democratic" state, the completion of the proletarian revolution and the organization of the new proletarian state—a policy which alone can realize Socialism.

And, in terms of simplicity and life, this problem is comprised in the class struggle and life itself.

This great issue split Socialism in Russia and in Germany: it is decisive. It has many vital aspects: the relation of parliamentary action to all forms of proletarian action, the necessity of developing the dynamic mass action of the industrial proletariat, the rejection of "class co-operation" under any and all conditions. To us in the United States, the problem of state power and its correlative aspects are distinct, for one thing, in the problem of industrial unionism. In the coming reconstruction of Socialism, the problem of state power will play a decisive role.

The general policy comprised in the revolutionary attitude to the problem of state power is not realizable in an actual revolution alone; it affects the policy of Socialism and is realizable in general forms under any and all conditions, in the piping days of peace and in the stern days of revolutionary struggle.